103

MIDDLE EAST PEACE AND OTHER VITAL INTERESTS

Y 4.F 76/1:P 31/20

Middle East Peace and Other Vital I...

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JULY 28, 1994

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
DEPOSITORY

OCT 28 1994

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

82-512 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044903-0

MIDDLE EAST PEACE AND OTHER VITAL INTERESTS

Y 4.F 76/1:P 31/20

Middle East Peace and Other Vital I...

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JULY 28, 1994

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
DEPOSITORY

OCT 28 1994

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

82-512 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044903-0

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
HARRY JOHNSTON, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY, Georgia
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida
ERIC FINGERHUT, Ohio
PETER DEUTSCH, Florida
ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN, Maryland
DON EDWARDS, California
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
LUIS V. GUTIERREZ, Illinois

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JAN MEYERS, Kansas
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DAVID A. LEVY, New York
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, Florida
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California

MICHAEL H. VAN DUSEN, *Chief of Staff*
RICHARD J. GARON, *Minority Chief of Staff*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

Page
Hon. Warren Christopher, Secretary of State 1

APPENDIX

Questions submitted for the record by Hon. Eliot L. Engel and responses thereto 45

MIDDLE EAST PEACE AND OTHER VITAL INTERESTS

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1994

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lee H. Hamilton (chairman) presiding.

Chairman HAMILTON. The House Foreign Affairs Committee will come to order.

We meet this morning to receive testimony from Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Mr. Christopher, we are very pleased to have you with us today.

The Secretary last appeared on February 24 to discuss the foreign assistance request for fiscal year 1995. Today, we want to hear the results of the Secretary's recent trip to the Middle East and what the future holds for that region. I have no doubt that members will have a wide range of other concerns they want to raise with the Secretary.

Mr. Secretary, it would be useful if you would present a brief oral statement to leave more time for questions from members. We will, of course, place your statement in its entirety in the record.

I want to advise my colleagues that the Secretary has to leave at 12:00 sharp, and it is the intent of the Chair to strictly enforce the 5-minute rule.

Mr. LANTOS. A new policy?

Chairman HAMILTON. A new policy. That is correct. When that red light comes on, the gavel will bang. We will immediately ask you to bring your comments to a close.

Mr. Secretary, that doesn't apply to you. You can respond in full, of course, to any question that is put to you.

We are very pleased to have you. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER, SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This has indeed been a month of extraordinary contrasts. We witnessed tremendous hope and opportunity. We also have seen terrible tragedy and suffering. From the talks on the Jordan shore of the Dead Sea to the historic meeting between Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein, American leadership contributed to another breakthrough for peace in the Middle East. We are helping

to draw the contours of a new peace across the map of a region that has long been vital to the United States.

But as we celebrate these exhilarating events, we are acutely aware of the scourge of disease, devastation, death, the ravages of the people of Rwanda. Closer to home, an illegal dictatorship continues to deny the democratic aspirations of the people of Haiti. These crises, to name only two, are tests of responsibility for the entire international community.

There are certainly challenges for this administration in our work with Congress, a challenge we are determined to meet together with you.

I look forward to discussing with you the events of the last month in the Middle East and elsewhere; but first, I want to place them in the context of our overall foreign policy objectives.

The most important contribution I make as Secretary of State is helping the President build and renew the lasting relationships, structures and institutions that advance America's enduring interests. These interests are to ensure our security, enhance our prosperity, and expand the reach of democratic institutions and free markets. Our strategy takes advantage of a moment in history where no great power views another as an immediate military threat. We are reinforcing our bonds with our European allies and Japan, intensifying our cooperation with Russia, and extending our broad engagement with China.

NEW ECONOMIC AND SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

We are continuing to forge durable structures of peace and stability in the Middle East and Asia, regions in which the United States has vital interests; and we are seizing the chance to build a more secure, prosperous and integrated world by strengthening, extending, and creating the institutions that serve our overarching objectives.

The recently completed G–7 Summit in Naples reflects this strategy. At President Clinton's initiative, our G–7 partners agreed to examine how to adapt the great post-World War II institutions, including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and the United Nations, adapting those institutions to the post-cold war era. This is a commitment, as the President said, to enable us to determine what we want the world to look like 20 years from now.

We must design in this period a new economic and security structure for the next century. Ratification of the GATT Uruguay Round is a crucial step in that process. Its approval will build an institutional bridge to the future by replacing the GATT with a new World Trade Organization.

We are also seeking fast-track authority to liberalize trade and investment with the growing markets in Asia and Latin America. We will begin with Chile.

NATO AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

Nowhere is the task of creating a new global architecture more urgent than in Europe. We are working to extend the benefits of the liberal trading system that are the pillars for the West to Central and Eastern Europe. President Clinton focused on comprehensive security objectives and strategies when he was in Eu-

rope during our most recent trip. In Poland, the President reaffirmed the importance of the Partnership for Peace, the most significant strategic initiative NATO has ever undertaken. This fall Poland will host the first joint exercises with NATO troops ever to occur in a former Warsaw Pact country.

The Partnership for Peace offers new democracies the best chance for eventual NATO membership. The United States is committed to helping them achieve that goal, the goal of NATO membership.

The last 2 months, of course, have been very important ones in the definition of the post-cold war world. The OECD, in a meeting I attended, agreed to membership talks with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and signed an historic cooperation agreement with Russia.

NATO also welcomed Russia into the Partnership for Peace, again at a meeting I attended in Europe along with my counterpart, Foreign Minister Kozyrev from Russia. The European Union invited President Yeltsin to its summit in Corfu and reached a market access pact with Russia. For the first time, the G–7 leaders included President Yeltsin in their regular political consultations. These events are important because we are integrating Russia into the West and into Western institutions in a very healthy way.

Another significant development, Russia joined the major industrial democracies in signing an expansive document at the G–7 meeting that supports U.S. positions on Haiti, North Korea, on terrorism, and on nonproliferation.

With respect to nonproliferation, I want to emphasize, we continue to attach the highest priority to resolving the North Korean nuclear issue. As you know, Assistant Secretary Gallucci will meet with his North Korean counterparts on August 5 in Geneva to continue the so-called third round of talks.

WITHDRAWAL OF RUSSIAN TROOPS FROM ESTONIA

Mr. Chairman, we welcome very much this week's agreement between President Yeltsin and President Meri of Estonia providing for the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Estonia by August 31. Coupled with the agreement the Russians earlier concluded with Latvia, this means by the end of next month, there will be no Russian troops in Central or Eastern Europe or the Baltic States. This is a concrete demonstration of Russia's stated intention to respect the sovereignty and independence of its neighbors.

Both the Estonian and Latvian agreements with Russia are attributable in significant measure to President Clinton's efforts to assist the parties when they reached a stalemate. I can personally attest to the fact that President Clinton's efforts were vital to breaking the stalemate in both of those negotiations.

NON-NUCLEAR UKRAINE

The successful transformation of the New Independent States to sovereign democracies is, of course, essential to the security of Europe and its stability. The importance of a nonnuclear Ukraine was a prime focus of the G–7 Summit meeting in Naples. At President Clinton's insistence, the G–7 agreed to assist Ukraine with more

than $4 billion over 2 years, provided that Ukraine moves forward with a program of fundamental economic reform.

The G–7 also pledged $200 million to help pay for the initial costs of shutting down the Chernobyl nuclear reactors and to upgrade Ukraine's newer-design nuclear reactor. If this plan is successful, the Chernobyl facility will be closed and closed forever.

We also expect to work with newly elected President Kuchma on continuing economic reform and implementing the trilateral agreement between Russia, Ukraine and the United States. The new President there has also pledged to uphold this agreement and also to accede to the nonproliferation treaty.

WAR IN BOSNIA

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the tragic war in Bosnia continues to threaten America's interests in a peaceful and integrated Europe. We have taken steps to contain the conflict and to alleviate its cruel consequences. Since the beginning of the year, the United States has led the effort to reach a negotiated solution. Our efforts have helped produce important advances such as the Muslim-Croat Federation and the Sarajevo exclusion zone. Working with our Contact Group partners, including Russia, we developed a plan that would respond to Bosnian Government needs. The Bosnian Government has accepted that plan unconditionally; but I am sorry to say that the Serb answer was tantamount to a rejection.

When the Contact Group presented the plan to the parties, we agreed rejection of the plan by either party would bear consequences. Tomorrow, I leave for a meeting of the Contact Group ministers in Geneva. Our principal purpose will be to decide what those consequences should be, unless by that time the Serbs have changed their minds and accepted the plan put forward. The agreed options for consequences include tightening the sanctions, enforcing the existing exclusion zones more strictly, and possibly identifying new ones.

Should these steps fail to bring the Serbs to accept the plan put forward, the parties recognize that the pressure to lift the arms embargo may then become irresistible. We must be prepared to impose increasing pressure on those who would reject peace.

HAITI

Turning to Haiti, our policy there is based upon a determination to remove the illegal regime and to restore democracy. The decision by the illegal government to expel the U.N. and OAS human rights monitors demonstrates a flagrant contempt by the coup leaders for the most basic principles of justice. This action has galvanized the nations of the hemisphere and the world to express their common conviction that the coup leaders simply must go.

Within the next several days, we expect the Security Council to adopt a resolution that will make clear the determination of the international community to return democracy to Haiti and to begin the process of national reconciliation. Our interests in Haiti are unmistakable. We must maintain stability in our hemisphere. We must protect democracy in this region, and we must resolve the refugee problem in a fair and humane manner.

RWANDA

Before turning to the Middle East, Mr. Chairman, members, let me address a situation that weighs on all of our minds, Rwanda. In that tragic situation, we confront what President Clinton called the world's worst humanitarian crisis in a generation. From the very beginning, we exerted intense diplomatic pressure on the parties to stop the killing and to agree to a cease-fire. We have led the international effort to alleviate the suffering caused by the civil war, contributing far more than any other nation to the humanitarian effort.

Then, in response to the sudden exodus of Rwandans into Zaire that began on July 13, the President sent AID Administrator Brian Atwood to assess the conditions on the ground. Last Friday, the President directed that $100 million be added to the $150 million already committed for humanitarian purposes. He also ordered the deployment of 4,000 military personnel to assist in humanitarian operations there, and he launched an around-the-clock airlift of supplies which is now in operation, with the airport in Goma being made a 24-hour airport. As of this morning, the United States will have delivered 3,800 tons of supplies, including the necessary equipment to purify up to half a million gallons of water per day.

I sent Ambassador David Rawson to Kigali to encourage the leadership of the newly installed government to establish the necessary conditions for the refugees to return to their homes. Assistant Secretary George Moose will travel to the region with Secretary Perry this weekend to review the status of the humanitarian operation, the security situation, and our diplomatic efforts. We hope that, with our help, the suffering will soon diminish and the process of national reconciliation can begin.

Mr. Chairman, we are greatly troubled and challenged by crises such as those in Rwanda, Haiti, and Bosnia, crises that touch our hearts and really at times, test our faith in humanity.

THE MIDDLE EAST

But the historic events this week in Washington have shown that no hatred is so intense, no conflict so intractable, that it cannot be overcome in time with courage and commitment. The historic joint declaration of Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein represents a watershed in the quest for peace in the Middle East. Together with the Israeli-PLO Declaration of Principles signed last September, and the multilateral talks, the Washington Declaration will help transform the Middle East landscape. Our aim in the Middle East is to replace a 40-year old pattern of conflict with a new structure of peaceful relations, a new structure between Israel and each of its neighbors and the entire Arab world.

It is certainly true that the Arab-Israeli conflict is not over yet; but today I think we can say with more confidence than ever before that it is on the road to resolution. There is no turning back now.

The White House ceremony on Monday marked the culmination of weeks of intensive diplomacy. The scope of what was achieved extends far beyond the powerful symbolism of a handshake. The Washington Declaration of the two parties is a practical document that establishes the foundation for a full-fledged peace between

Jordan and Israel that not only terminates the state of war but does practical things such as opening direct phone links, planning for the integration of their electricity grids, opening border crossing points and allowing free access for third country tourism. It provides for negotiations to open an international air corridor, to develop bilateral economic relations, and to end the Arab boycott against Israel.

I think it is especially significant that King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin have committed themselves to meet as often as necessary to conclude a formal peace treaty. I know the members of this committee appreciate the significance of these dramatic and moving events. We know how long the American people have waited for the day when leaders of Jordan and Israel would stand side by side to proclaim to the world their readiness to make peace. I am sure we all understand the courage required for both of them to make this great leap into history.

Clearly, President Clinton does, for he has repeatedly said that our country would support countries and leaders willing to take risks for peace. Jordan and Israel have done their part. Now we must do ours. Jordan, in particular, is suffering under the burden of a crushing foreign debt that is crippling its economy. We should be prepared to help with Jordan's legitimate security needs as well as helping them deal with their debt. We are urging Congress to assist Jordan, to send a clear signal to the people of the region that America stands with those who are peacemakers.

During my last visit to the Middle East, I went to Gaza and held discussions there with Chairman Yasser Arafat. I stressed to him the continued willingness of the United States and other international donors to support the Palestinian Authority so it can govern wisely and well. Certainly economic development is essential if we are to give Palestinians the sense that with peace can come real change on the ground, making the lives of their people better. At the same time, I stressed to Chairman Arafat the importance of meeting donor needs for accountability as the international assistance is received. We really need help from the Palestinians in order to enable us to help them.

Finally, on the Israeli-Syrian track, my recent trip confirmed that a chance for progress now exists. I do not expect dramatic results immediately. The issues on the table are very tough. They touch on the core interests of security, peace, and territory for both parties. Both sides have very serious leaders; Prime Minister Rabin and President Asad are weighing every move with extreme care. I found in both of them a deep engagement on the details of the negotiation. Both are determined, I believe, to find a way for a political settlement. President Clinton and I are prepared to do our part to help them succeed; and to that end, I plan to return to the region sometime during August.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss a very serious subject: the terrorist bombings in Latin America and London serve as a tragic reminder that the enemies of peace remain formidable. We will not allow the killers involved in those terrible incidents to succeed. Groups like Hezbollah that wreak havoc and bloodshed

must be defeated and Hezbollah's patron, Iran, must be contained. The horrible events of last week are a clarion call for the international community, including some of our key allies and friends. Iran is an international outlaw; yet some nations still conduct preferential commercial relations with Iran and some take steps to appease that outlaw nation. They must understand that by doing so, they make it easier for Iran to use its resources to sponsor terrorism throughout the world.

The recent bombing attacks in Latin America and Europe make clear that the effort to defeat terrorism requires a concerted international response. The United States is working with its allies around the world to improve coordination and intelligence-sharing. This will aid in the apprehension of those responsible for those crimes and help to prevent future atrocities. I have directed the Department's counterterrorism experts to review all of our existing procedures and mechanisms to look for ways to improve our international efforts of coordination.

In this hemisphere, we are taking some particular steps to combat the latest wave of attacks and to prevent future attacks. The United States has dispatched our Government's top forensic experts to Latin America to assist in the investigation of the bombings in Argentina and Panama. I have directed the State Department's Coordinator for Counterterrorism to consult with our Latin American neighbors in the near future to develop a concrete plan to combat terrorism in this hemisphere.

Finally, as host of this year's Summit of the Americas, the United States will move to make terrorism in our hemisphere a priority issue on the agenda of the summit.

In the long run, of course, the best way to ensure that terrorists fail is to pursue peace with determination and resolve. We will, I am convinced, ultimately see a lasting and comprehensive peace between the Arabs and Jews, a peace that is just and secure for all people in the Middle East, a peace that sees Israel safe and fully integrated into the political and economic life of that region. Those results, of course, will be the best answer for terrorists, but in the meantime, we must take new and strong action to deal with this wave of terrorism which we witnessed last week in such dramatic form.

President Clinton told Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein on Monday that "the United States will walk the final miles with you." The events of the past weeks, looking back over the past months, I believe demonstrate the strength of our commitment and the rewards that come from our constant engagement.

The United States is indeed the world's sole remaining superpower. We are blessed with great resources and great resolve and will continue to use them with vision and strength to enhance our own enduring interests and the interests of the world.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAMILTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman HAMILTON. The Chair wants to recognize we have a group of parliamentarians from Lebanon here. We are pleased to have them and are honored by their presence in the hearing room. We are also honored by the presence of a number of Arthur Byrd's

fellow journalists from the United States and Germany. We are pleased to have them.

Mr. Secretary, before I turn to my questions, let me remind my colleagues that you must leave at 12:00. The Chair will enforce strictly the 5-minute rule. The gavel will bang when the red light goes on. We will proceed to the next person after you complete your response.

Mr. Secretary, all of us were thrilled, of course, this week with the events in the Middle East; and we want to extend to you and to President Clinton our congratulations for the role you played personally, as well as the President, in bringing that remarkable event about. This is the second time in less than a year that you have played host to a major breakthrough in the Middle East peace process. You deserve high praise for that.

My questions, however, relate not to the Middle East. I have two; one relating to Bosnia and the second to North Korea.

BOSNIA

You identified in your statement the sanctions, or I think you described them as "consequences" that might take place if the Serb—Bosnian Serb answer continues to be no: tightening the economic sanctions against Serbia, expanding the exclusionary zones, lifting the arms embargo.

The questions with regard to Bosnia—I will put these all in front of you, if I may; you may respond as you like—are what do you really expect to come out of this Contact Group that is now negotiating with the Bosnian Serbs? And if you move to these consequences or sanctions, what is going to be the U.S. commitment? What is it likely to entail if we move to tightening the sanctions, if we move to extending the weapons exclusion? I recall General Rose saying, if you are going to expand those exclusionary zones, you will need 18,000 troops on the ground.

What does it mean if we lift the embargo? That is the question with regard to Bosnia. What are the implications for the United States?

With regard to North Korea, just one question really: My understanding is that if those spent fuel rods are now in the cooling pond and can only stay there for 3 months, as I recall—the time runs out at the end of August—what will we do if North Korea moves those fuel rods to the reprocessing plants and begins to extract the plutonium?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, first, with respect to the question on Bosnia, as you know, the background of this is that starting in February of this year, the United States undertook to determine what kind of a peace plan would be satisfactory and workable from the standpoint of the Bosnian Government. We have conferred with them. The Contact Group met with them and all the parties, and came forward with this peace plan. The Bosnian Government has indicated that it accepts that unconditionally; though, of course, there are many painful compromises as there are in any peace plan. They have indicated an acceptance of the plan.

CONSEQUENCES OF BOSNIAN SERB REJECTION OF PEACE PLAN

The Serbs have turned it down up to this point.

The ministers representing the Contact Group countries indicated a series of consequences that would take place if one party turned it down and the other party did not.

You asked what would be the consequences for the United States? Well, first, with respect to the tightening of the sanctions, the principal tightening of the sanctions would be in the economic area. At the present time, there are some loopholes in the sanctions, mainly affecting Serbian interests outside of Serbia. There are subsidiaries that operate in other countries, Mr. Chairman, and remittances that come from other countries to Serbia. I think if we can tighten the sanctions in this way, we can have a further effect on the Serbian economy. I think that that is quite within the contemplation of the United States, something that we can do; if not easily, I think quite effectively.

The second of the consequences would be to more strictly enforce the existing exclusion zones at Gorazde and in Sarajevo. I must say the events of the last 48 hours make me feel this is a very high priority. The Serbs have been violating those exclusion zones. I think they may have just in the last few days sought to send a message to the other parties that they still have great power. So I would say that we need to have a stricter enforcement of the existing exclusion zones; and that will require perhaps a further use of NATO air power. Now NATO is ready. They are ready to respond to requests from the United Nations; and I think they are also ready to make it known to the United Nations that they feel a response is required. This, once again, I think, is within the contemplation of our existing forces and our existing decisions.

The extension of the exclusion zones is something that will take very careful planning. I think that it is correct to say that we need to ask whether or not there are an adequate number of troops available to extend the exclusion zones. I also think we will have to plan very carefully for the extension of them, perhaps one by one; but nevertheless, that is something that the Contact Group ministers are committed to do.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Contact Group ministers agreed that—as a last resort, the lifting of the arms embargo probably would become irresistible if the other increased sanctions or consequences were unsuccessful. The lifting could come in two forms. It could be a multilateral lifting if all the parties agree; or we are also committed—and this is in the letter from the acting Secretary of State to Majority Leader Mitchell—we would commit—if the multilateral lifting did not take place and all these other steps were undertaken, we would commit to consult with Congress with respect to a unilateral lifting of the sanctions.

This is a very difficult problem. The lifting of the arms embargo carries with it a number of very serious problems. The question is what the Serbs would do at that point and what the reaction of the international community would be to the Serbs' reaction. It is something we have to think about with great care and recognize there are no simple solutions in this intractable problem.

But that is the series of steps that would be gone through, Mr. Chairman, by the Contact Group initially; and then the Contact Group ministers.

As I said, the Contact Group itself, that is, our people at the working level, were represented by a very fine Ambassador, Charles Redman. The ministers will be meeting in Geneva on Saturday to work through these issues if the Serbs have not accepted by that time.

NORTH KOREA

On your second question involving North Korea, Mr. Chairman, I can give a briefer answer. The basis of our going forward with the discussions in Geneva, the so-called third round of discussions, is that there be a freeze on reprocessing and that no new fuel be introduced into the nuclear plant. If they go forward with reprocessing the fuel rods, that would be a violation of the basis on which the third round of discussions are going forward. So unless there is some new agreement as to how that reprocessing would be done, the reprocessing itself would bring an end to the talks in Geneva because it would destroy the basis for the talks.

Chairman HAMILTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Let me also recognize the presence of visiting congressional research fellows from the Bulgarian, Slovakian, and Albanian parliaments.

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.

EDA TO JORDAN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We are always honored by your presence. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, I have three complex items, but I realize the time restraint. The first one deals with Jordan and Israel; the second one on the barbaric act by the Castro regime; and the third one of a press report about the United States fixing the U.S. interest section in Havana.

The first one dealing with the Jordan and Israel peace accord, certainly, we welcome what you correctly labeled this morning as the termination of the state of war between these countries. However, last night, it became public, reports of a new agreement between Israel and Jordan and the United States of giving Jordan surplus defense articles. We would appreciate it if you could give us concrete details on what exactly these surplus articles are, if you could.

CUBANS SEEKING ASYLUM DROWNED

The second one dealing with the barbaric act of the Castro regime that took place just several days ago, I joined Congressmen Diaz-Balart and Menendez this morning in presenting a letter to you asking for a more forceful U.S. response to this attack by powerful water hoses upon this tugboat filled with 70 freedom-seeking Cubans, filled with women and children. Dozens of them drowned; the remaining males were taken to jail. The relatives reside in our congressional district. Not only is this a very pressing foreign policy problem for us, it is also a domestic concern as well.

The Senate passed a resolution condemning this, asking the U.S. Representative in the U.N. to take a more forceful approach in continuing to press this issue in international bodies to try to get more

countries to join us in our condemnation, as well as asking the whereabouts of the remaining freedom-seeking refugees.

The third one is a report this morning in our local paper in Miami that United States is going to spend several millions of dollars in fixing the U.S. interest section in Cuba.

If you could give us details on that—those are three burning issues in our congressional districts, if you could touch on those, Mr. Secretary.

DEBT RELIEF AND PROVISION OF EDA TO JORDAN

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

First, with respect to the situation in Jordan and the question about the excess defense articles, what the President has indicated to the Jordanian Government is, we would work with them both with respect to relief from their debt as well as the possibility of making available to them excess defense articles.

With respect to the debt issue, Jordan owes the United States approximately $700 million. The President's intention would be to seek during this fiscal year relief of a certain part of that debt, a little less than a third; and in subsequent fiscal years, if the relations between Jordan and Israel and Jordan's commitment to seek a peace treaty are fulfilled and realized, to go forward with a request to Congress for additional debt relief.

I would stress to you that this is something that needs to be done by the administration in close coordination with the Congress, as is the initial tranche, which I believe would result in the extension of $193 million in Jordanian debt relief. The remainder would exist for future consideration.

With respect to the excess defense articles, what we have agreed to do is to study any request from the Jordanian Government with respect to making available lethal defense articles. At the present time, Jordan is undertaking a review of its defense structures in order to modernize them, so we do not have before us any specific requests. There will come before Congress a request to make available in principle excess defense articles at some future time. I cannot be more specific than that because we do not have the request and will not have any until Jordan completes their review of their military structure in terms of the downsizing of the same kind we are doing here.

CONDEMNATION OF CUBAN INCIDENT

With respect to the Cuban incident, I understand and recall President Clinton deplored that incident. I think the State Department, through its spokesman, issued a very strong statement condemning what the Cuban officials had done. Cuba tried to hide this incident for a while, as I recall. Then it became known to the press, and we have condemned it. I will certainly study carefully the letter that you have sent to see if there is anything further that we can do to be effective in that regard.

On the third part of your question, I found the best thing for me to do when I don't know is to admit it. I really don't know anything about plans to spend a lot of money on the interest section. I have not seen that story in the Florida papers. We will look into it and

let you know if there is anything to it. As far as I know, there is nothing to that.

[The information follows:]

I can confirm that the U.S. Interests Section in Havana is undergoing a major rehabilitation project necessary to ensure the building's security and keep the building in adequate operating condition. The rehabilitation of our building in Havana is part of a series of rehabilitation projects to preserve U.S. real property abroad. The project includes roof repair, renovation of the consular section, redesign and renovation of the main lobby, a new perimeter fence, asbestos removal and upgrading the exterior public acess control area. The total cost of the program is estimated at $20 million.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Lantos.

PRAISE FOR HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I have a brief word of commendation, a brief comment, and one question.

Mr. Secretary, I want to give you and the President the highest possible praise for your historic achievement in the Middle East. Many Presidents and many Secretaries before you have attempted, with the best of intentions, but it is President Clinton and Secretary of State Christopher who have succeeded. I want you to know there is not a Member of Congress on either side who does not stand in awe of your achievement on this score, and you deserve full praise and full credit.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Lantos.

DEFENSE OF ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANTOS. Secondly, Mr. Secretary, as probably one of the last practitioners of bipartisanship in foreign policy, I was appalled by the partisan attack leveled at you and the foreign policy of this administration by some would-be Presidential candidates. The only way I can explain this is that they must be suffering from an advanced state of Alzheimer's disease because they clearly do not remember that the failure to finish Saddam Hussein off in the Persian Gulf War, the collapse of Yugoslavia with the ethnic cleansing and the bloodbath and the mass rapes, and, of course, the North Korean diversion of materials for nuclear production took place under the previous administration. As a matter of fact, North Korea first diverted weapons-usable plutonium in 1989 when both you and President Clinton were just distant little blips on the political horizon. So I think it is important—very important for our friends in the other political party to place the blame where it belongs.

THREAT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Now to my question.

This afternoon, my Subcommittee on International Security will hold a hearing on the Pan Am terrorist bombing of many years ago. Next Monday, we will have a hearing on the recent terrorist attacks in Argentina, Panama and the United Kingdom. What is happening, Mr. Secretary, is a frontal assault on civilized society; and the response of civilized society, including our own response—has

been totally inadequate. As a matter of fact, despite the fact that close to 200 American citizens lost their lives in the Pan Am bombing, no significant response really has occurred as of this morning.

There have been sanctions, rhetoric, conversation, but the families will be sitting where you are sitting now, this afternoon, outpouring their anguish and pain. I share their frustration because it is simply unacceptable that 4 years after the Pan Am bombing, the perpetrators have not been brought to justice.

With respect to Argentina, Panama, and the United Kingdom, we are confronted basically by a terrorist international movement supported by Iran, condoned by Syria, and not resisted forcefully by the international community. In an attempt at bipartisanship, the next Republican leader, Mr. Gingrich, and I will be presenting a resolution to the Congress on Monday calling on the President to summon a top-level international conference dealing with international terrorism. I earnestly hope that both you and the President will support this resolution, and there will at long last be effective action—not rhetoric—in dealing with this issue.

I note in your testimony you say, "yet some nations still conduct preferential commercial relations with Iran and take other steps to appease that outlaw nation."

I wish, Mr. Secretary, you would name the nations that conduct preferential trade with Iran. I wish you would name the nations that appease them. That is the only way to focus negative publicity on people who support terrorism.

I ran 6 seconds over time, Mr. Chairman.

LIBYAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR PAN AM BOMBING

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Mr. Lantos.

With respect to the Pan Am bombing, I share with you the abhorrence of that and the lack of any progress in bringing the killers to justice. As you know, we have had a sanctions regime against Libya that has not been yet effective; and we are trying to increase the level of our sanctions. I will be meeting with our allies, France and England, on that subject, trying to persuade them to take tougher sanctions, and to go for the oil embargo sanctions.

Up to this point, we have had a series of increasingly tougher sanctions. None of them have been successful. Libya finds one reason or another not to turn over the two individuals who are responsible for these events, or at least we feel they are responsible for the events.

I guess I would say, Mr. Lantos, we have taken the steps up to this point to identify the perpetrators of this crime. A major investigation was undertaken; I think a brilliant forensic job was done to determine that those who were responsible were in Libya, even though that was not the initial hunch of the investigators; and now I think we need to just keep the pressure on to try to force Libya to turn them over for trial here in the United States or in the United Kingdom.

As you know, we have any number of proposals from the Libyans to try to find some other way, some less onerous way to have them tried. We resisted every one of those proposals and will continue to do so. I think the fact of those many proposals coming to us from

Libya indicates the sanctions are hurting. I hope that we can devise some sanctions that will hurt even more.

IRANIAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR HEZBOLLAH ATTACKS

As you know from my statement, going to the second aspect of it, I feel very strongly that we must take some new action with respect to these international terrorist incidents. I am very distressed that some of our allies are among those, at least in my judgment, who do not recognize the full responsibility of Iran for the Hezbollah attacks around the world. I feel Iran is the principal culprit in the situation, and they need to be identified and they need to be both contained and restrained in what they are doing.

Those allies who are engaged in this activity know who they are, and we are going to be sharing our intelligence about Iran with them to see if we cannot draw them back from this conduct which I think unnecessarily encourages Iran and is very destructive of the international coordination we should have. I am just absolutely mystified why these countries are unwilling to put their commercial interests aside and recognize this kind of terrorism must be dealt with and dealt with very harshly.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Diaz-Balart.

Then Mr. Berman.

QUALIFICATIONS ON JORDAN'S EDA ELIGIBILITY

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, it is always a pleasure to be able to meet with you. I want to begin by commending you, as well as the President, like our colleague, Mr. Lantos did for your leadership and the great successes in the Middle East peace process.

With regard to a prior comment that you made this morning, on the specificity, on the issue of excess defense articles to Jordan, I am a little bit concerned. I would obviously expect that full specificity, although it is not possible at this time; but at the same time, I think it reasonable that the administration not expect there to be congressional approval until there is such specificity.

At the very least, could the administration assure us that F–16's or F–15's would not fall under the excess defense articles category?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. At the present time, I think there is no contemplation of weapons systems of that character. We will have to see how the future unfolds here.

My own judgment at the present time is that such weapons systems would not be in contemplation until there is a full peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. I think other kinds of lethal equipment, that is small arms and so forth, might be appropriate under the present circumstances. Until there is a peace treaty, I think that weapons systems of that magnitude would not, in my judgment, be appropriate.

CUBA AS WORLD TROUBLE SPOT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Secretary, I must admit that I found it unfortunate and somewhat objectionable that in your formal statement you omitted Cuba from your survey of the world's trouble spots, even though as my colleague, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen mentioned,

just 2 weeks ago one of the most brutal massacres in the 35-year history of the Castro regime occurred less than 90 miles from our shores.

My question would seem to be, what must the Cuban-American community do, and its allies that want to see, because there are obviously many allies, not only Cuban-Americans, that want to see Cuba freed. This country has a long tradition of support for, in a bipartisan fashion, freedom and democracy for Cuba, one of our closest neighbors.

Would you not agree, sir, due to the continued omission of Cuba from the—from the even elemental survey of the trouble spots of the world, there seems to be no choice but for those who want to see Cuba free—and especially the Cuban-American community in the United States—to intensify its militancy and its lethal action of protest within the parameters of the law to see if not only the administration but some of the national media will pick up Cuba on its radar screen?

COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY IN CUBA

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I want to emphasize that that recent action by Cuba was a good example of the brutal character of that regime. We are proceeding to carry out the Cuban Democracy Act, which is one of the most severe set of sanctions that there is on the books anyplace. This is a relationship between the administration and Congress which is a very determined one. I did not put it in my statement simply because we are following a course of conduct that is well established and determined here in the course of a statute enacted by the Congress and approved by the President, but it certainly is a problem that gnaws at us continuously.

This recent event is a reminder of the brutal character of that regime and the need to seek the establishment of a democratic government in Cuba. We will continue to work for that.

I can tell you that even though it didn't happen to make its way into my statement today, it is regularly on the minds of the people in the State Department and will continue to be.

I know there are a number of members of this committee who are very concerned and seized of that issue. That is a good reminder to me and the State Department to keep on working on it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Berman.

COMMENDING ADMINISTRATION'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I hate to be repetitious, but the event is so momentous and the administration's work is so notable, I think it is worth just repeating the previous comments of a number of my colleagues. This may be particularly true for those of us who have a personal and emotional as well as intellectual belief that an intense U.S. involvement and steadfast support for a strong U.S.-Israeli relationship is key to the safety and security of Israel, to the furtherance of Western and American interests and to the movement of the peace process. I think from its beginning, this administration, and you, have really been just incredibly strong, unwavering in support on these serious issues that have come up in the context of the Middle East,

have taken the correct position. When we watched King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin, it seemed as if they could have done this 40 years ago. But we know that that isn't true. We know it took particular skill and adroit work to bring this about and, for the future, to build on what occurred. So we are very appreciative.

RELEASE OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR U.N.

I want to ask you a couple of questions. One is on peacekeeping. We finally, thanks to your and the White House's leadership, have gotten the Congress to recognize its obligations to fund our arrearages for peacekeeping and to make a major appropriation.

We have also seen the conditions put in place for further funding of our regular assessments to the United Nations with the conditioning of that funding on the establishment and appointment of an Inspector General at the U.N.. The U.S. and State Department have gotten the U.N. to agree to a resolution setting up an Inspector General, and I think this is a major achievement for which you should be congratulated; but it is only a first step.

There are certain other things that need to be done before money that is appropriated can be released to the United Nations. I wondered if you would be willing to outline for the committee your plans for securing those conditions, so that the U.N. can start to achieve the kinds of reforms and efficiencies we want.

DELIVERY OF ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINIANS

My second question for you is with respect to the Middle East. We have been involved really since last September in a multilateral effort to provide aid for the Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank in order to assure that they see tangible benefits derived from the peace process. In the course of that, there has been some concern, which on the surface might seem trivial, but in the context of the importance of the issue, I think has great meaning about where that aid will be administered from, and the effort of some to use this process to tip the United States on one side of the debate over the status of Jerusalem.

I was wondering if you could comment on the administration's position on the instrumentalities for delivering that aid, where the offices would be set up, and the administration's position.

Thank you.

U.S. POSITION ON STATUS OF JERUSALEM

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Congressman Berman, let me take the second half of it first. As you know, the Declaration of Principles between the Israelis and the Palestinians has a particular provision with respect to Jerusalem. It says Jerusalem shall be determined as a final status matter; that is, it will be determined in the final negotiations. And it is the position of the United States that we will count on that being done at that time and not prejudge the matter. It is a matter for negotiation between the Israelis and the Palestinians as part of their final status negotiations.

With respect to the administration of the aid, we do not plan as a general matter of policy to deal with the Palestinian Authority in Jerusalem. We believe we should not deal with the Palestinian

Authority in Jerusalem and will not, as a general matter, do so. We have a consulate in Jerusalem; we will continue to use it for its normal purposes. But in dealing with the Palestinian Authority on matters of aid to Gaza and Jericho, we intend to deal on that matter in Gaza and in Jericho.

I hope I have given you the reassurance you are looking for. We do not intend to try to tilt the issue of Jerusalem, which, as I say, is the final status matter, by dealing with the Palestinian Authority in Jerusalem. We will deal with it elsewhere.

ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENT TO U.N. REFORM

On the first question that you asked with respect to the United Nations, we welcomed the strong indication from Congress as to reform that has to take place within the United Nations before the funds are released. It now appears we will have an Inspector General. The concept has been agreed to. From our standpoint, we need to not only have the concept, but select a strong and effective person to undertake that role.

We want to see other reforms within the United Nations system to ensure that the funds are more efficiently used and the operations are more efficient. We will be carrying out all the specific indications Congress laid down for the forwarding of those funds to the United Nations. As I say, we welcome working with Congress on this. Working together, we are achieving something within the United Nations structure.

Thank you.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Manzullo.

ASSISTANCE FOR RESETTLEMENT OF RUSSIAN OFFICERS

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for coming here this morning. I have been advised that President Clinton offered to give $25,000 American taxpayer dollars to each Russian officer in Estonia to help the Russian officers resettle back to Russia. Is that correct?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I don't know whether the numbers you are using are exactly correct, but it is certainly true that the United States in its aid to Russia has set aside a certain amount of those sums for housing in Russia of the retired military officers.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Secretary, how can this be justified in light of the fact that we have American veterans in this country who are homeless? First the administration gave tens of millions of dollars to ex-Iraqi POW's to bring them to this country. Now we are giving American taxpayer dollars to Russians living in Estonia, to send them back home.

Mr. LANTOS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. No, I won't.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANZULLO. My question to you, Mr. Secretary, is how can we justify these types of expenses which seem to give preference to soldiers overseas as opposed to our own veterans?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Let me say, Congressman——

Mr. LANTOS. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. MANZULLO. I would like the answer. If there is time, I would yield.

Chairman HAMILTON. The gentleman refused to yield.

Mr. Secretary?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I think the commitment of support for democracy and reform in Russia are some of the best dollars that we spend; and this is part of that overall package of aid to Russia.

One of the important things we can do is to provide for the reintegration of Russian soldiers from abroad into Russia. I suppose you could make the same argument you made with respect to any of our assistance to Russia. Essentially, your point would prevent us from giving any assistance to Russia.

As I say, those funds serve the interests of the United States.

Mr. MANZULLO. How? How can we justify giving this type of money to Russian soldiers to go back home where they are going anyway?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. The aid to Russia, as I say, is a great investment for the United States. If the Russian democracy and reform turns out to be reversed by internal consequences, you will find our defense budgets having to rise again, you will find the nuclear threat back on our plate.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Secretary, you are telling us there is going to be a nuclear threat because we would refuse to give money to Russian soldiers to send them back to Russia?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I am saying that the assistance we give to Russia supporting democracy and reform is money spent to ensure that Russia continues to move in the right direction.

Mr. MANZULLO. We understand that that is the reason for the aid. If it is money to be used to take nuclear rockets apart, we can understand that. But I think it is totally, totally wrong to send money to Russian officers just so they can go home where they belong. American veterans are very much upset about that, and justifiably so.

I would yield to Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would merely like to point out to my friend that the measure he is talking about had the strong and commendable bipartisan support of the Republican leader, Mr. Michel; the Republican whip, Mr. Gingrich; and I believe most Republican members of this committee.

This was a very intelligent move on the part of the U.S. Congress, which recognizes that infinitesimally smaller sums than what we have spent during the cold war may now to be spent for peace. This is a brilliant investment in our security.

I would welcome my friend's support for housing for American veterans as well, but this is not a new policy by this administration.

Mr. MANZULLO. It may not be a new policy, Mr. Lantos, but it is a wrong policy. American veterans will not tolerate it.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Gejdenson.

COMMENDING MIDDLE EAST ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, let me join my colleagues in commending you on your efforts in the Middle East. You know, when you watch a high wire act, it starts to look easy as you see the circus performers

walk from one side to the other and flip over. I would suggest most of us, even with a net, shouldn't try to walk the high wire.

I think watching you with the Israelis and the Palestinians and now with the Jordanians, it is starting to look awfully easy. I would say we would not be in this state unless both parties had tremendous confidence in you and the President, and you are to be commended for it. I hope you keep making it look easy as we continue on this road.

I would say parenthetically to my friend, Mr. Manzullo, had he been in this Congress for the time many of us have been here, where resolution upon resolution for freeing the Baltic States of Soviet occupation came before us, where Americans joined together in praying and fighting and calling for the freedom of the Baltic States, now that we have the opportunity to get the troops out of the Baltic States, we ought to get them out of there as quickly as possible. The Soviet occupation went on all too long in the Baltic States.

PROPOSAL FOR INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE TEAM

Let me turn for a moment to the future. I think frankly we are in a transition, as everybody recognizes, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. You can see America's old political instincts of isolationism returning. For those of you who think it is maybe a present-day phenomenon, clearly it is not. Harry Truman, with the Marshall Plan, having just seen Europe ravaged by the Nazis in war, had to fight hard to get the Marshall Plan put into place. John Kennedy, in the midst of the cold war and the confrontation with the Soviet Union over missiles in Cuba, had a hard time getting public support for foreign aid programs like the one we have just discussed.

I think one of the problems we are going to face without this kind of unifying enemy is to find a way to make sure we have the ability to gain the expertise we have in diplomacy with at least the threat of force. Because without some reasonable threat of force, it is very difficult to intervene in the kinds of situations we have seen in Somalia, Rwanda, Yugoslavia. I think it is almost impossible for democratically elected leaders to take young men and women who volunteered to protect their country and have a President, a prime minister move them to some other front. That is why I think we need to develop a military force within the U.N. that is made up of people that volunteer out of the militaries of the U.N. membership.

I know that in some parts of this country that makes people awfully nervous. I think unless we have a well-trained unit within the United Nations that is there and ready to move, all the diplomacy in the world isn't going to solve some of the brush fires that break out and cost tens of thousands—even hundreds of thousands of lives. And it will be impossible for this administration or administrations in the future or other governments to act.

I really think we are going to have to take a look at some international response team that is trained in advance of a crisis, that is funded through the Defense Department budgets of these various countries, and then you can use our Government forces and other government forces for moving supplies, for air activities, etc.

But for the kind of ground forces—had we put them in Yugoslavia at the beginning of the crisis, I think we could have saved a lot of lives and a lot of tears.

I would hope one of the things you do in your tenure as Secretary of State is take a look at how we get from where we are, that in each instance the United States has to lead together—pulling together 10,500 troops from here and there and try to make them a military unit overnight, or standing back and watching the kind of bloodshed that I don't think Americans want to see happen, as we have seen happen recently in Rwanda.

IMPROVING THE RESPONSE TO HUMANITARIAN CRISES

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much, Congressman. You have described, I think, one of the most vexing problems for policymakers who do not have an adequate solution to that problem at the present time. As you indicate, the burden frequently falls on the United States because of our superpower status, and because we have the resources. Though I must say that there are problems with the solution that you propose; whether or not the United Nations, if they established such a force, would be overstrained in the first weeks or months that they had such a force, I think this is one of the real issues. You can be certain that I and my colleagues in the State Department and the national security apparatus will continue to be concerned about how to deal with these brushfire problems around the world that require some international attention and yet probably may not involve the vital national interests of any single country.

They are basically humanitarian issues. We will continue to be very concerned about those and see if we can find a better solution than we have presently.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Gilman.

CRITIQUE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for scheduling this important hearing. I want to commend our Secretary of State for his outstanding work in the Middle East, efforts that we all witnessed, the culmination of it this past week. We hope you will continue in that part of the world to try to bring the parties together.

Even as we applaud that success, we have to face the fact there are many other troubled areas around the world, for example, Haiti, Bosnia, North Korea, Somalia. Just yesterday, this committee held a hearing with experts on public opinion on foreign policy. They agreed that to build support for any foreign policy initiative, the administration must first conceptualize that policy, then explain it clearly to the American people and their elected representatives in Congress; and that the President must lead in that process. Those witnesses noted that foreign policy doesn't lend itself to thinking out loud or offhand ruminations by the administration that require later explanations and rectifications.

There is an old maxim in police work: you don't draw a pistol unless you are about to use it. Too often we have drawn our pistol, but put it back in. I wonder how that has affected public opinion with regard to a vacillating foreign policy?

I believe I speak for our colleagues when I say we are prepared to work with you, Mr. Secretary, and the administration to make certain we better articulate and define our foreign policy, so we do not have the kind of criticism we have been receiving of late for a foreign policy that is much too weak.

STATUS OF ISRAELI-SYRIAN NEGOTIATIONS

I do have a few questions, Mr. Secretary, with regard to Syria. Can you tell us where the peace negotiations stand at this moment?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Congressman Gilman, as I said in my statement, we are at an exploratory stage of those negotiations. The encouraging news is that both parties, that is, Prime Minister Rabin and President Asad, seem to me to be determined to try to find an answer. They are grappling with the toughest issues. Being as experienced as they are, they are making every move with great care, but I think we are on a path that will test the opportunities for a settlement in the relatively near future.

I don't expect any immediate breakthrough, but I am going back to the region sometime in August, probably in the first half of August, to continue the discussions. I have discussed this matter for hours with each of the parties, and I will say I think there is the possibility of progress because both parties see it as in their interests to try to reach a peaceful solution to the situation that they find themselves in. I don't believe I can go beyond that.

Our role as a facilitator is one that seems to be essential to the parties. I have urged them to engage in direct negotiations, but at the present time, particularly the Syrians wish to deal through the United States and through me, and so I will be available. And as I say, probably the best way I can say it, Mr. Gilman, is that it is worth my time and the effort of the United States to continue this process. I think it is sufficiently serious to continue our deliberations. Both parties asked me to come back in August.

REEVALUATION OF DRUG STRATEGY

Mr. GILMAN. We wish you well in that endeavor. Mr. Secretary. We have seen for the first time since the Carter administration an increase in drug use among Americans. Is there going to be a reevaluation of our drug strategy? Many of us criticized the strategy being focused on just the hard core abusers.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Our policy is in the course of a reevaluation under the so-called Drug Czar to focus more on the problems of treatment and rehabilitation, to try to diminish the draw effect in that field. Of course, at the State Department, we have a program to try to limit the importation of narcotics into the United States. That is also undergoing constant evaluation to see if we cannot be more effective in that regard.

DEFENSE OF ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Gilman, I don't know whether you intended to pose it as a general question or a general comment, but I wonder if you would let me respond to your comments about our foreign policy, generally speaking. As I said in my statement, I think one of the most

important things I can do is to help the President renew and rebuild the structures, the institutions that we have. I think we need to work at those with great perseverance.

I think we are in a period of considerable flux and change in the field of foreign policy. We are having to adapt to foreign policy at a time when we do not have a single overarching enemy. Within the structure of the world today, I think our foreign policy has been sound. We have dealt with the major issues. We made economic security a principal issue. We have revitalized NATO through the Partnership for Peace. We have dealt well with the big issues in the major countries of the world—Russia, Japan, China. So although obviously there is always room for improvement in any foreign policy, I believe under the President's leadership we are dealing effectively to build new structures, to build a new architecture for the next century; and we will continue to do that with the help of the Congress.

I am glad to hear and I know it is characteristic of you, that you are willing to work with us on these problems. I am certainly willing to work with you, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Menendez.

AGENDA FOR SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. MENENDEZ. I also want to join my colleagues in congratulating you and the President on the historic agreement. Certainly when one has a position as your own, the legacy you leave behind at the end of that period of time which you might serve as Secretary of State will have to be one of your shining moments. I think it also will be one in American history. So I think you have assured your place in that context.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I want to raise an issue of concern and an issue in which I am deeply disappointed. My concern is with reference to—I have sat here for a year-and-a-half as a member of this committee. I have listened with great enthusiasm on various occasions to your presentations. I am concerned that the Summit of the Americas that is coming up just 4 months away, a summit that obviously we called and that there is a great expectation among the hemispheric governments—having spoken to several of their leaders in the last several months, I am concerned that, you know, when I listen to the presentations made, Latin America is but—especially post-NAFTA, is really very, very—extremely low on the totem pole.

I know one might say, well, that is not the case for calling a summit, except that a summit is easy to call. It is much more difficult to make it successful.

In that context, I have tried to find out whether we have been sending delegations, U.S. delegations to other countries in the hemisphere to discuss the actual agenda of the summit. A summit requires intense collaboration and negotiation in order that consensus on issues of mutual importance can be achieved before the summit begins. Trade seems to be the byword of the summit. Certainly that is of great importance.

You and I both recognize, having gone through this with you before, that we are not ready to enter with a whole host of countries into a NAFTA-type arrangement. I know that you mentioned Chile again, but I am concerned that when I see your statement today, but for the bombings in Buenos Aires and Panama, what would be the mentioning of Latin America right here within our own hemisphere? So I have real concerns about the summit.

I would appreciate your addressing that and how we are getting along in developing an agenda. I know you just talked about adding terrorism to that agenda. I would like to know what, beyond trade, we are going to be talking about. What have we heard from our Latin America neighbors? What are we doing?

SILENCE ON CUBAN INCIDENT

Then let me address the question for which I have a great disappointment. For over a year-and-a-half I have sat here and waited to hear, without our asking, to hear you speak about Cuba. And for basically a year-and-a-half, I have been disappointed. I would have hoped today in a world review that an incident that happened just 2 weeks ago yesterday for which 40 innocent men, women and children died, a barbaric act in which the Castro government permitted a boat of 70 people whom they could have stopped at their coast go out 7 miles to sea and then rammed that boat, hit people with water cannon, have over 20 children die, would have been condemned in the strongest possible way.

I know the President made his statements in Miami. But I will say that other than the obligatory comment I read from the State Department, which is far from a strong condemnation and—we are not pursuing the Organization of American States. We are not pursuing the United Nations. We have done very, very little.

It is a silence, a deathly silence that I personally, as one member of this committee, cannot continue to tolerate despite the fact I have cast my votes almost each and every time giving the benefit of doubt to both the State Department and this administration.

You know, Mr. Berman mentioned a personal emotional and intellectual commitment to the question of Israel. There are several of the members of this committee who share the same type of commitment on the question of Cuba. We would hope to see some more from the State Department on this soon.

PREPARATION OF SUMMIT AGENDA UNDERWAY

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Mr. Menendez.

With respect to the summit, plans are going forward in a very determined way for that summit. We have sent a number of delegations to Latin American countries to talk to them in a sequential and careful way about what they think should be on the summit agenda. Although it was called by the United States, we do not intend to try to dominate the agenda.

So we are still trying to determine what will be the main subjects on the agenda in addition to the trade issue you mention, which I must say is on the agenda not solely because the United States wants it but because it is the number one topic of most of the countries we talked to in Latin America. But, clearly, democracy and the need to take steps to preserve and enhance democracy

within the hemisphere will also be a very important subject on that agenda.

Fortunately, we are in a situation where all the countries of the hemisphere except Cuba and Haiti are democracies at the present time, but some of them need encouragement, some need great care to maintain and nourish them. I am sure that that will be a major subject.

Terrorism, as I said this morning, should be on that agenda.

I think there will be on the agenda as well, at least based upon the contacts we are making around the hemisphere, a discussion as to how, at an international level, we can try to produce a better life for the people within the hemisphere. That, in many instances, comes down to jobs and the other aspects of life that improve the existence of the individual on a daily basis.

I believe, Congressman, that we are going to have a briefing of Mr. Torricelli's subcommittee within the next few days—I think it is tomorrow—to discuss our plans for the summit. We will certainly be quite willing to consult with you. I would be quite sure the issue of Cuba would come up in the discussions of the importance of both preserving and enhancing democracy within the hemisphere.

CONDEMNATION OF CUBAN INCIDENT

With respect to the incident you mentioned, I commented on that a couple of times this morning already. It is a reflection of the brutality of the present regime in Cuba. We are following the Cuba Democracy Act, which is an instance of bipartisan cooperation between Congress and the administration. We certainly have limitations on what we can accomplish with the present regime.

I can assure you that when we condemned that act from the podium of the State Department, it was not pro forma, nor was it when the President deplored it. We will continue to work with you on that issue.

I received a letter from some members of the committee. Perhaps you were involved in that. I will study that letter and see if there is further action we can take. In the long term, though, as you well know, the best thing that can happen there would be for our embargo and our other actions to cause a change in that government because it would be unlikely there would be any dramatic improvement until there is a change at the top of that government.

Thank you, very much.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Smith.

CONCERN OVER U.S. POSITION AT CAIRO CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, welcome. Mr. Secretary, I was at a conference in Lima, Peru over the weekend. There were delegates from all over South and Central America concerned about the attacks on the family, as they see it. I have a great deal of empathy for their argument. They—and I found this when I attended the PREPCOM meeting in New York on the Cairo conference—are very, very concerned about the pressure, the lobbying that has been undertaken by the United States with regards to promoting abortion on demand globally as part of the Cairo document.

The language itself, as you know, has been bracketed. It will be finally debated and adjudicated in Cairo. Nevertheless, the U.S. delegation has been very vociferous in promoting abortion.

There has been a backlash. I have seen it in talking to delegates. I saw it in talking to grass-roots people, many of whom made up this conference in Lima.

I have a couple of questions I would like to pose and I will pose them on this and a few other issues because I know under the 5-minute rule we have a very, very limited amount of time.

The first question with regards to the Cairo conference, our U.S. policy in general. Is there any conditionality or linkage whatsoever, either now or perhaps in the planning stage, with the provision of U.S. foreign assistance for any nation that has a pro-life statute that does not accede to our lobbying, or for any entity—be it the World Bank or any other lending institution—with regards to that country's position on either population control or abortion?

DRUG INTERDICTION IN PERU AND COLUMBIA

I would also like to raise the question, Mr. Secretary, with regards to the drug interdiction efforts in Peru and the—and in Colombia. When I met with President Fujimori on Friday, we had a wide-ranging discussion on human rights, the efforts to rein in on the Shining Path and on drug interdiction efforts. The President was almost incredulous the United States would remove one of the most effective tools we have had and they have had in cracking down on drug trafficking.

The DEA reports that since the radar information ceased in terms of the sharing, the amount of flights have increased approximately 20 percent. When Assistant Secretary Gelbard came before our subcommittee, Mr. Torricelli's and my subcommittee, he said interim agreements were in the works, probably by week's end, probably as early as 24, 48 hours, there would be an interim agreement concluded that would resume the sharing of that vital information to—that this poison would be mitigated in terms of its coming to this country, of cocaine and other illicit narcotics. That was over a month ago. It was on June 22 we heard that.

Mr. Gilman has taken a very lead role in trying to get the U.S. Congress to make it very clear that we want the sharing to continue. I know that the United States can exercise its prosecutorial discretion in not prosecuting if it is the conclusion of the administration lawyers that the law does not permit this. But I think there is flexibility. I think it is a very tortured logic that says that our U.S. personnel perhaps in the—in Peru or Colombia might be in violation of the law, a very tortured logic.

The bottom line is these drugs are getting to the United States. The amount of drugs are increasing. It can be stopped. Again, President Fujimori said, why are you doing this? We want to work in a cooperative way with the United States to lessen these drugs.

Finally, one other question before my time concludes. On Haiti, since we are seeking U.N. authorization for all possible scenarios there, including the use of force, will the administration seek congressional authorization prior to any military action on Haiti?

I would yield to the distinguished Secretary for answers.

U.S. DOES NOT PROMOTE ABORTION

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Chairman, I see members are using their 5 minutes very well by giving me a series of questions.

Chairman HAMILTON. They have a lot of experience at it, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. On your first question, Mr. Smith, let me tell you in an unambiguous way the United States does not promote abortion. We do not regard abortion as an alternative to a safe and voluntary means of contraception.

I don't know what the basis is of your statement that we are promoting abortion; I assure you, we are not. That is not the stance we intend to take at Cairo or have intended to take in the run-up to Cairo.

I met in the Vatican with the senior officials of the Vatican and with the Foreign Minister of the Vatican when the President was meeting with the Pope. I assure you, we communicated to them our concern for the family and we indicated to them that we do not intend, as part of this conference, to promote abortion or to try to support abortion as an alternative way of family planning.

Now, I think from that, you can see that the United States would not be imposing, as you said, conditionality with respect to its aid; and this situation is one on which I think our position is and will be clear. And I would think that the results of the Cairo conference will reflect the position that we are taking.

We do indeed have a concern about unsafe abortions and we want to try to have the conference recognize the need for women to have medical services so as to avoid unsafe abortions or deal with the consequences of unsafe abortions. I suspect that that would not be something that would be controversial, even from your point of view.

DRUG INTERDICTON POLICY

With respect to the drug interdiction matters, I believe it was the judgment of every lawyer in the administration who looked at the matter that there was a serious legal problem with our furnishing information—you call it radar information—to the countries that might result in the shooting down of civilian aircraft. No one I think would want to subject American officials to possible criminal liability. For that reason, the President moved very promptly to ask Congress to deal with the issue, to ensure there would not be criminal liability.

In the interim, he asked that there be arrangements worked out so as to be able to provide the information. I will inquire as soon as I get back to the Department to see where those agreements stand.

Now, an interim agreement takes two to be worked out. We were going to insist on—indeed, I think our law would require—that the countries receiving the information make a commitment that it not be used to shoot down civilian aircraft. But I think the parameters of that kind of an agreement are clear enough. We will try to see that that is done.

We have exactly the same goal as you do. That is to achieve the interdiction of these aircraft. I think it was only because we found a legal problem that required the correction of Congress that the action was taken. The President's statement that we would seek a change in the law and also seek interim agreements, I think was a reflection of his strong conviction that we need to give priority to interdiction.

On Haiti, we are seeking now a resolution at the United Nations of international support for a coalition force and ultimately then a United Nations force for Haiti. In connection with that, I can assure you that we will be in very close consultation with Congress as we move forward in this picture. We intend to obey all the laws and regulations that are in effect in this situation. Beyond that, I will not be able to go, Mr. Smith.

It is my responsibility to maintain the Presidential prerogatives of the Constitution—the constitutional prerogatives the President must have to protect Americans abroad and carry out his foreign policy responsibilities. But I can assure you, we will be in close consultation with the leaders of Congress and that we will comply with the resolutions and laws of the United States.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Deutsch.

IMPLICATIONS OF AID OFFICE IN JERUSALEM

Mr. DEUTSCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too want to add my congratulations, and I believe it is for each of us to heap words of praise on both you and the President in terms of the historic events that occurred this week.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Deutsch, swing the microphone a little closer, would you, please?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask three specific questions related to the peace process in the Middle East. The first regarding the AID program in Jerusalem. In followup to Mr. Berman's question I heard your answer, I heard his question; but if I can try to be a little more specific, because it is obviously an issue which is of great concern to a large number of Members of Congress, as I am sure you are aware.

The Helms-Moynihan amendment passed the Senate. Specifically, is there a plan for an AID office in East Jerusalem to administer part of the AID program in Gaza and Jericho—the specific part of that question.

The second part of the question really is—and again, I heard your answer to Mr. Berman's question, but I want to be a little more specific, because I think it is important. Will there be or have there been or are there now scheduled meetings between State Department officials, AID officials and PLO officials in Jerusalem?

I understand the answer to your question that it will be administered, obviously, physically through Gaza and Jericho. But if the implementation is going on through Jerusalem, the concern of Mr. Berman and myself and others is that we really are making a statement, tipping the balance of the final status negotiation, which you have specifically said you do not want to do. But if that is occurring, I think that that is unfortunately leading in that direction.

If you can be specific in those answers?

CIVIL ADMINISTRATION OF GAZA AND JERICHO

The second question relates to the administration in Gaza and in Jericho today. Chairman Arafat said he is having—he has acknowledged and, obviously, press accounts of your own people on the ground have acknowledged he is having difficulty in administration. How much of that is related to funds? How much is related to the political climate on the ground? Are we aware of, at this point in time, any elections that will be scheduled in Gaza or Jericho?

The other members of the agreement of countries, the donor conference, will those countries be part of the statements that we have issued and, I guess, regulations we have issued that the requirement for funds is tied to compliance to the agreement?

REPORTS OF JORDANIAN EXPORTS TO IRAQ

The third question is—again, a specific question. There was a press account in the Christian Science Monitor that Jordan exported dual-use equipment to Iraq. Can you specifically respond to this allegation? I would appreciate that as well.

JERUSALEM OFFICE WILL NOT ADMINISTER GAZA/JERICHO AID

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. On the first question, Mr. Deutsch, there are no plans to have the AID office in Jerusalem administer our aid to Gaza and Jericho. Not only are there no plans, but there is no intention to have that happen. So I can assure you on that point.

Second, as far as I know, there have been no meetings between AID officials and Palestinian Authority officials in Jerusalem. It would be our intention that there not be such meetings.

There is a consulate in Jerusalem where I sometimes have met with officials of the PLO as part of my responsibilities there in the Middle East. I would assume that such meetings might continue in the future; but as far as the administration of our AID programs, it will not be done from Jerusalem. I assure you that the AID office in Jerusalem will not be administering our aid to Gaza and Jericho, and there will be no meetings between our AID officials and the Palestinian Authority in Jerusalem.

That is the intention we have. That is the plan we will carry out.

STATUS OF GAZA/JERICHO ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Second, with respect to your question on the PLO and Gaza, I am not sure whether you were in the room, Mr. Deutsch, when I said that on my last visit, I made a trip to Gaza and met with Chairman Arafat and his key advisers in Gaza, which I must say was quite an emotional and gripping trip for me. The conditions in Gaza are very adverse. Many people are out of work. The population obviously is heavily weighted with young people who need assistance of various kinds. The infrastructure there is very, very badly deteriorating.

The point I made to Chairman Arafat was the need for them to follow the rules and regulations and procedures of international

donor organizations. I urged them not to fight the system but to find ways to comply with it. I do think there is a problem of their understanding that they are in a new environment, in a new period where the international organizations, because of their provisions and sometimes because of the laws of the countries, are not able to provide the aid without certain procedures, such as receipts.

After I left, Under Secretary Spero stayed on for about 2 hours to help them understand the procedures of the international organizations. I think there is a real gap in their understanding of what is necessary, based upon the fact that they have not been a government, nor had experience with this kind of administration.

I think it is probably accurate to say there was a certain amount of mutual frustration. Chairman Arafat was frustrated with the procedures he had to comply with; on my side, frustration in my effort to try to convince them that the far better way was not to fight the system, but to comply with it and to provide the receipts and information necessary to obtain the information.

I am not aware of any recent provision of dual-use equipment from Jordan to Iraq. I would appreciate any more information that you have from that Christian Science Monitor story so we can look into it and we can get back to you. I am not aware of that. I will get back to you if you provide us with the story.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Hyde.

AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, very fine to see you here.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning.

Mr. HYDE. Parenthetical comment only, no response requested or required.

I was always concerned when one of the great Senators from the other body used to take umbrage at the appointments of Ambassadors by the Bush and the Reagan administrations as being rewards for political loyalty and service. I note with some interest that 39 percent of the Ambassadorial appointments are political in this administration. It was 30 percent in Reagan's and 25 percent in Bush's. I only say that Senator whom I have in mind has been remarkably silent on this, so I may have to remind him.

That is just a parenthetical remark. I personally think appointing political supporters to Ambassadorships may be the only answer because we are so chintzy on representational funds. They have a horrible burden of meeting a social calendar.

RUSSIAN MILITARY SALES TO IRAN

But that is really not the important thing I want to talk to you about. I have been very disturbed over what I have been reading over the last 18 months that Russia has continued its aggressive arms sales to what can only be described as "rogue states." That is where the Middle East comes in, particularly Iran.

It has been reported that sales on the order of $1 billion, nearly a quarter of Russia's total military sales, are to Iran. According to press reports I have been tracking, advanced Russian weaponry transferred to Iran include two diesel powered attack submarines with mine-laying capability, with a third sub due to be delivered

soon; 24 SU–24 fighter bombers; unconfirmed reports of as many as 50 MiG 29's, MiG 31's and SU–27's; an estimated 200 T–272 MiG battle tanks and an assembly line for producing those tanks, a variety of antiaircraft, antiship missiles and as many as a thousand advanced antiship mines.

There is peace in the Middle East today. We are on a euphoric high. But long term, I think we have to keep our eyes very peeled on Iran and Iraq. There is a law, the Iran-Iraq Nonproliferation Act of 1992, that states when there is a determination that any country has contributed knowingly or materially to either Iran or Iraq acquiring destabilizing numbers or types of advanced conventional weapons, then mandatory sanctions kick in.

I have the law here. These are—one of the mandatory sanctions is suspension of U.S. assistance except humanitarian for 1 year. Now has that balance of power threshold been crossed vis-a-vis Iran?

Russia—I know their need for hard currency; but here we are doing something that I—I don't agree with my colleague, Mr. Manzullo, and I agree with you. I think the transformation of the former Soviet Union to a free market democracy is essential for the peoples of the world; but at the same time, we don't want to be taken for Uncle Sucker.

We are sending billions over there. Through the back door, they are selling billions to rogue states like Iran. It is not just Iran either.

Here we have a law that is pretty tough on that kind of action. So having been schooled through Iran-contra, October Surprise, all of this righteous indignation at flouting the law, I wonder if we are not doing the same thing now?

POLICY ON AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Congressman, thank you very much.

I cannot resist a brief comment on two matters you mentioned only incidentally. With respect to the appointment of Ambassadors, I think if you look back at the statistics, usually in the first year of the presidency the numbers tend to be weighted toward the political appointees. President Clinton's goal and aim is to maintain the historic percentage that has frequently been in both Republican and Democratic administrations, about 30 percent noncareer and 70 percent career. We will be proceeding toward that goal. I also very much appreciate your recognition of the burden that Ambassadors have by way of entertaining.

Mr. HYDE. I am not in the least bit critical. I think that is a tough job, a backbreaking job. You get the best people you can. Careerists—and I am all for careerists—but the cost of that job has to be factored in. Not every careerist has the wherewithal.

I am not critical of anybody but that Senator who I thought was unrealistic.

Thank you.

DEFENSE OF RESETTLEMENT AID FOR RUSSIAN OFFICERS

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. The way the pattern of the questions came up, I really didn't get a chance to comment on Mr. Manzullo's remark that American veterans would strongly resist the aid we

are giving to the Russian soldiers that are getting out of the Baltics. I could not agree with that less.

We are getting Russians out of Central and Eastern Europe for the first time since World War II. I think every veteran who served in that European theater would be glad to know we have taken the steps to get the Russian troops out of the Baltics and enable those countries to move forward to a destiny of freedom and democracy.

URGING RUSSIAN RESTRAINT ON ARMS SALES TO IRAN

Now on to your question about Russia, Mr. Hyde, I would say that we have been very concerned about Russia's dealing with Iran. The President raised it with President Yeltsin. I raise it frequently with Foreign Minister Kozyrev. We focused our initial attention on weapons of mass destruction to try to assure the Russians did not transfer to the Iranians weapons of mass destruction which would be more destabilizing than the other weapons. We have been very anxious to include Russia in COCOM or the successor to COCOM so we would have some way to have an orderly basis for objecting to their arms sales to Iran.

I was very pleased that when we were at the G–7 summit in Naples, Russia joined the political statement which called attention to the terrorism of Iran. I thought the statement, although it was relatively mild in its text, was important because, for the first time, Russia, France, and Germany joined us in the condemnation of terrorism sponsored by Iran.

We are going to continue to work on that problem and continue to encourage the Russians to exercise the same kind of restraint toward Iran that we are, because they are an international outlaw. This recent series of Hezbollah bombings, which I lay in many respects at the door of Iran, will give us another good argument for dealing with Russia and urging them to restrain their destabilizing sales to Iran.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Fingerhut.

STATUS OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN AUTONOMY AGREEMENT

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Secretary, always good to see you. Again, congratulations on the events of this week. I would also add that perhaps we cannot handle two euphoric events in the same week. We focused on the euphoria at least. The notion of the last Russian troops leaving the captive nations is something we ought to be euphoric about, for which you and the President deserve credit. May I suggest that perhaps there be an occasion on which we can celebrate in the same way we focused this week, so the world can focus on that achievement as well?

Let me follow the tradition of this committee and ask you a series of unrelated questions in my 5 minutes. You might want to take notes. I will try to be brief, though.

The first is, you have recently been in the Gaza, Jericho area. You referred to it as a "moving experience." I am sure it was. I would be interested—if you have not already given it to this committee in a moment I was out of the room—in your assessment of how the progress of the autonomy agreement is going. We hear all sorts of conflicting reports. What is really happening on the ground, in your view?

REPORTS OF SYRIAN BALLISTIC MISSILE PRODUCTION

The second, staying in the Middle East, we all recognize the next most difficult hurdle is negotiations with Syria. I have to say that it will not come as a surprise to you that the general sense of warmth with which King Hussein is greeted in this country and which we feel toward him is not the same feeling many of us have toward President Asad. We have somewhat more skepticism regarding his position; and my colleague, Mr. Deutsch, asked you about an article that was in the Christian Science Monitor about arms in Jordan.

I would like to ask you about an article in the Defense News about Syria, which—that article reported the Syrian Government is soon going to begin full-scale production of the Scud C tactical ballistic missiles by mid-1996. Obviously, my question is, what is your information with regard to this? How do you view Syria's seriousness about making peace if in fact they are further building up their sophisticated weaponry?

CONSULTATION ON HAITI

Finally, moving back to this hemisphere, to the question of Haiti, if you would briefly comment on at what point and in what manner do you think the administration will consult with the Congress in a formal manner if it determines that some military action is necessary?

You clearly have—are taking the appropriate steps, going to the Security Council, putting in place the military assets necessary, and you have made clear—at least the statements we have heard out of the White House have made clear, they understand the constitutional role of Congress.

I am anxious to see how you would imagine that playing out.

I thank you for your responses to all of the above.

ASSESSMENT OF AUTONOMY AGREEMENT

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much.

I don't think, by nature, I am often given to euphoria. Let me say I can handle two pieces of good news the same week; I hope it will happen more often.

On Gaza, I would say the autonomy agreement seems to be working quite well in the area of the police and law enforcement. Prime Minister Rabin indicated his satisfaction with the plans that the Palestinians have had with respect to law enforcement in Gaza. That seems to be working somewhat better than anticipated.

What is not working as well as anticipated is the flow of the funds for reconstruction or for improvement of the infrastructure in Gaza. That comes back to the issue I mentioned of Chairman Arafat and his colleagues' failure to recognize the need to comply with the procedures of the international organizations.

There are a number of projects that are just waiting and ready to go, awaiting the application and the necessary forms from the Palestinians. I hope they will be forthcoming in the near future because there is an urgent need for projects there.

One project, for example, is a $15 million project for cleaning up all of the garbage and refuse in Gaza. One of the really sad things

as you drive through Gaza is to see the number of places where there is garbage and trash lying in open fields. Obviously, it is a terrible blot on the landscape there. That project can go forward if the various documents are completed. I think there has been disappointment on that front.

We have been working very hard through Under Secretary Joan Spero and Ambassador Ross to try to help them understand the need for the necessary documentation.

There is not only that project but many projects ready and waiting to go. The funds are there and what is needed is the documentation.

I would say there are very many talented Palestinians. They have many people who are well educated and well trained. I think it is a bureaucratic difficulty of being able to bring that talent to bear effectively on the documentation that is needed.

POLICY TOWARD SYRIA

With respect to the negotiations on Syria, I think they are serious, substantive and well worth pursuing. I think the best way to ensure Syria does not feel the need to have these large weapons programs is to see if we cannot draw them into the community of nations. I understand that President Asad is not recognized here with the same warmth as King Hussein. On the other hand, he is the leader of a very powerful nation. I think that it is desirable to continue to negotiate with him on behalf of the Israelis.

As I may have mentioned when you were out of the room, both parties want us to play a facilitative role, and we definitely will.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Does your answer assume the report is accurate about the buildup of those particular weapons?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Nuclear weapons?

Mr. FINGERHUT. No. The Scuds.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. One of the things I don't do, Mr. Fingerhut, is comment on intelligence matters here in open session. So I just want to pass any comment on that. I want to go to the deeper issue, which is to try to find ways to ensure Syria is drawn into the community of nations and does not feel the need to develop weapons of that character.

CONTINUED CONSULTATION ON HAITI

Finally, with respect to Haiti, my best answer is that the consultation will be a continuing one. I believe it was only about a week ago I met with the leadership of both the House and Senate, along with the other members of the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, the Ambassador to the United Nations, and General Shalikashvili. We were briefing on various subjects, but the one that took most of our time was Haiti.

We will continue in that same mold to brief the Congress as this matter goes forward and to ensure that our consultations are just as full as can be permitted by the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I want to add my voice to those who have complimented you and the President for the marvelous, marvelous job with the peace agreements. While the press like to dwell on the negatives, I think there have been so many positives coming out of this administration with regard to foreign policy, and I want to compliment you for the obviously great role you played in it.

I want to add my voice to those who have mentioned the concern about a possible AID office in Jerusalem. We met with Mr. Atwood several weeks ago and expressed our concerns as well.

I want to ask about the boycott, because it has been a passion of mine for the past several years, the Arab boycott of Israel and also of American companies, the secondary and tertiary boycott. I noticed in the Washington Declaration signed by Jordan and Israel that "Negotiations on economic matters will continue in order to prepare for future bilateral cooperation including the abolition of all boycotts." That is a quote.

Is Jordan currently participating in the primary, secondary, and tertiary boycotts of Israel and the United States? Does this statement indicate that any part of the boycott may be dropped? Can you bring us up-to-date on the possible discussions involving other Arab countries vis-a-vis the boycott, notably Saudi Arabia?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Let me work from the general back to the specific, if I may.

It is one of our primary goals to bring to an end the boycott of Israel by the Arab states. In every conversation I have in an Arab country, I raise that question. I am glad to tell you that it seems to me that the effect of the boycott is breaking down very rapidly in practical terms. In many respects, the secondary and tertiary boycott is respected very little in the Middle East at the present time even though it is still a de jure matter, that is, it is still on the books.

Twice the Arab League has met or scheduled meetings to try to add various products or companies to the boycott, and twice they have had to cancel those meetings because of the lack of a quorum, which I think is a reflection of the changing attitudes in the Middle East.

There is a good deal of commerce going on between Israel and some of the Gulf states despite the existence of the boycott. Kuwait has indicated that the secondary and tertiary aspects of the boycott are no longer effective. All throughout the region, the effects of the boycott are being practically attenuated.

I look forward to early action by the Arab League, which I hope would have two aspects. First, it would end completely the secondary and tertiary aspects of the boycott and also provide for a local option, that is, to enable each country to decide on its own whether or not to maintain the primary boycott. I think that that would be the step that would ultimately free us from the boycott.

Now, with respect to Jordan, what they have done in the Washington Declaration is to indicate that they would work for the end of the boycott in all respects. There are still relics of it with respect to Jordan, although the business arrangements, the practical ar-

rangements that are being negotiated between Jordan and Israel, indicate it is all but a dead letter between those two countries; and certainly will be as they move toward joint business on the border, as they move toward tourism between Israel and Jordan.

So I think that that was a very positive statement, an indication we cannot only have the concrete action by Jordan but have them be one of the advocates for the lifting of the boycott within the Arab League.

PLO COMPLIANCE WITH DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Mr. ENGEL. I have two other subjects, one involving the Middle East and one involving the Balkans.

A number of us have formed what we call the Peace Accord Monitoring Group; a group of us here in the House and Senate formed a group to monitor the compliance of the peace accord between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Engel, I have been enforcing very strictly the 5-minute rule. I will ask you to ask that question and we will try to get to you on a second round.

Mr. ENGEL. OK. I am very concerned that Mr. Arafat seems to be saying one thing for American public consumption in English, but quite other things when he speaks with the Palestinian population with regard to the peace accords.

I am also very disturbed that the PLO covenants calling for the destruction of Israel are still in place although he promised to take steps to remove those articles, although to my knowledge no steps have been taken. Could you comment on the compliance by Mr. Arafat and the PLO with the peace accords and also the issue with the covenants?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I didn't hear the word. The——

Mr. ENGEL. The covenants in the charter. Steps were supposed to be taken to have them removed as part of the peace agreement. To my knowledge, no steps have yet been taken.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. With respect to the general commitments, we expect him to observe them. He under took a number of commitments at the time of the Washington Declaration of Principles. We are following that. We regularly remind him if we think he is not complying.

I think, in general terms, he and the PLO have taken some positive action with respect to violence in the territory. They have been very effective within Gaza, for example, when there is violence against Israelis, to move quickly not only to condemn it, but to round up anyone who might be involved in it. That is why I think Prime Minister Rabin has indicated that he was pleasantly surprised by the effectiveness of the Palestinian police and law enforcement. That is not rhetoric, but a reflection of the practical actions of the PLO.

On the second part of your statement, I have to ask for an opportunity to look into that to see whether or not that has not been erased in the way it was anticipated. I understand the commitment you mentioned; I did not realize they had not taken the formal action to do that. I will look at that and get back to you.

[The information follows.]

In a September 13, 1993 letter to Prime Minister Rabin, Chairman Arafat committed to amend those clauses of the PLO Covenant calling for the destruction of Israel. The PLO Covenant can only be amended by the 500-member Palestinian National Council (PNC). On May 4, at the signing ceremony for the Gaza/Jericho agreement, Chairman Arafat reiterated his commitment to Prime Minister Rabin in writing to convene the PNC at the earliest opportunity to amend the PLO Covenant. Recent statements by senior PLO officials indicate the PLO plans to convene a PNC in Gaza in the near future. To date, the PLO has not done so. We continue to urge the PLO to take this step and amend the covenant.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Secretary, I understand you have to leave a few minutes before 12? Is that correct?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Yes. I ought to get out at 5 minutes to 12.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Gilman.

HAITI

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Secretary, with regard to Haiti, will the President come to Congress before he initiates any hostile action?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Congressman, I just have to repeat the answer I gave before: We will be in close consultation with the Congress. The President will obey the various laws and resolutions that affect this kind of situation.

It is my responsibility, and I intend to carry it out, to preserve the President's constitutional prerogatives in the field of foreign affairs and to protect Americans. As I say, you can be sure that we will engage in regular consultations with the Congress.

Mr. GILMAN. We just hope they will be enough in advance so that Congress isn't there after the fact.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, with regard to that assurance.

Mr. Secretary, with regard to Haiti, 48 elected deputies of the Haitian parliament wrote to us recently urging a bipartisan commission be established and that they go down to Haiti, take a look at all of the problems, consult with all of the leaders, come back and make a recommendation to the Congress. Do you think that such a proposal would be helpful in the peace process?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Not at all, Mr. Gilman. I think it is a delaying tactic on the part of the illegal government there. They know what they need to do. That illegal government should depart from the scene and allow the restoration of democracy. I think that kind of commission would just be a recipe for continued delay and procrastination on their part.

AMBASSADOR TO CYPRUS

Mr. GILMAN. Just one other question, Mr. Secretary.

With regard to Cyprus, the position of our U.S. representative for Cyprus has been vacant since Ambassador Lamb retired back in May. Can you tell us where we stand on the selection of a new representative for Cyprus?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. We are certainly making inquiries and doing interviewing with respect to that. Mr. Gilman, I can assure you the matter does not escape our attention, although there is a vacancy. I have raised that question and been involved in that myself with officials both in Greece and Turkey.

We have an excellent Ambassador in Cyprus, Richard Boucher, following the matter very closely at the present time. We will soon select a Cyprus coordinator.

I want to emphasize that that issue is very much before us even though that job happens to be vacant at the moment.

Mr. GILMAN. I hope you can make an early selection.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN TURKEY

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Secretary, let me direct your attention for a moment to Turkey. I have been concerned about the war in the Southeast between the Army and the Turkish population. I would like to know what the administration is doing to urge the Turkish Government to stop pursuing a military policy to the problems of the Southeast and to work on a political approach with the elected political representatives of the Kurdish population.

Could you comment on how you assess that situation in Turkey, and what we are doing and should do about it?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, we assess that situation as being a matter of concern and importantance. The President has raised that issue with Prime Minister Ciller. I frequently raised it with my former colleague, Foreign Minister Cetin, who I am sorry to say has left the government and has now been replaced. I hope the person who has replaced him will have a deep concern for the human rights of the citizens of southeastern Turkey.

That is a problem which I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, is not exclusively a military problem. It is one that needs to be handled by reaching out to the Kurds and finding ways to include them in the governmental processes. We are going to continue to make that point at every opportunity.

As I am sure you know from the Turks, the response is that they have a very serious internal security problem. I have never felt the solution to those internal security problems was advanced by violations of human rights. It is a matter on which I am not satisfied that we have a fully adequate approach.

As you know, Assistant Secretary Shattuck has been in that region. I think he is somewhat encouraged by the intentions of the Turkish Government to try to address it on a more inclusive basis rather than on a purely military basis. But it is something that is a matter of concern to me.

But I would want to say also that Turkey is an extremely important country to us. They are in a key location, a situation where it is very important for us to maintain a secular Turkey that is not intimidated by the extremism of the Islamic movement; and so I think that we need to do it in a context of balance with respect to Turkey as well as great concern for the human rights issue.

ELECTIONS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Chairman HAMILTON. Were the elections in the Dominican Republic fair and free and open?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. We think that there were serious flaws in the elections in the Dominican Republic. It would be our hope

that there would be scheduled on an early basis new elections to overcome the flaws of the prior elections.

I believe, if I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, there was a commission that looked into that and found there were serious abuses of the voting records in the Dominican Republic. Unfortunately, it is a situation where the election was so close that those abuses might well have made a difference. So for that reason, we have encouraged new elections to be scheduled.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Lantos.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, three quick issues, one that I raised earlier, namely, international terrorism.

What is the status of your knowledge as of this morning concerning the terrorist acts in Argentina, Panama, and the United Kingdom; and in conjunction with that—although I realize you have to see the form of our resolution—in principle, are you in favor of the President calling at the highest level an international conference on terrorism?

SYRIA

My second question relates to Syria. It seems to me that there is a profoundly schizophrenic approach to Syria. On the one hand, Syria is properly viewed as a country providing safe haven to terrorist groups. There are recent indications of a newly warming relationship between Hamas and Mr. Assad. On the other hand, you very much want to draw Syria into the peace process. I wonder if you could lay out for us the enticements you have offered Mr. Assad to change his ways and to turn toward a more civilized form of international conduct?

PUBLIC EXPECTATIONS OF RISK-FREE FOREIGN POLICY

Finally, Mr. Secretary, I would like you to make a general observation about the need for U.S. foreign policy to be both proactive and—I will spell this out in a minute—not overly averse to taking risks, even at the possibility of some costs.

If a person were to arrive from Mars, he would be baffled by a country which routinely accepts hundreds of thousands of deaths from tobacco, alcohol, driving, criminal violence and drugs, but is totally unwilling to contemplate the notion that it may have to assume some other kinds of risks related to our unique role as the remaining superpower.

Now, I am as concerned as anybody in this room about human lives but there is a total disconnect between our routine acceptance of hundreds of thousands of murders and death in this country, unnecessary ones, and a total unwillingness in terms of the conduct of our foreign policy to assume any risks. I think and until this gap is closed, our role as a superpower will be a very tenuous one.

CALL FOR MORE PROACTIVE FOREIGN POLICY

With respect to the proactive issue, I think Rwanda is the perfect example. We are not the world's policeman, but we have a respon-

sibility to organize proactive preventive steps. It would have been infinitely less expensive to keep the 2½ million people who have fled Rwanda in place, and we would have saved 500,000 lives had there been a small African international force deployed in Rwanda by the developed world when the crisis began.

And the picture that some of us are getting is that until we have mass rapes or cholera epidemics, the response of the civilized world is very puny. That only in the face of such horrendous events as we have seen in Bosnia and Rwanda do we gear up to deal with a crisis that could have been prevented.

TERRORIST ACTS IN ARGENTINA, PANAMA AND LONDON

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Lantos, those three questions are enough for an evening's discussion.

Mr. LANTOS. You name the evening.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I will try to be as succinct as I can be.

With respect to the terrorist acts in Argentina, Panama, and London, those are really under investigation, as I mentioned in my statement; we sent our best forensic experts both to Panama and Argentina to help on those. I have read that a subgroup of the Hezbollah has claimed responsibility—or credit, if you will—for the action in Argentina.

Sometimes those claims are accurate; sometimes they are not. I think we will have to wait until we get further information about them. I think it is a fair assumption to say that Hezbollah is at the bottom of some of those instances, perhaps all of them, and that they are supported by their patron, Iran.

With respect to the resolution you offered, you are quite right, Mr. Lantos. We want to look at it. But anything that would focus the attention of the international community more effectively on terrorism would certainly be something that I would want to support.

Actually, I came back from the Middle East before this long series of events, fixed in my mind that we had to do something more about terrorism, because Hezbollah is causing difficulties all over the world; and it is clear at the present time that no country is immune from that kind of dreadful attack.

APPROACH TO SYRIA

With respect to Syria, we are not satisfied with their approach to the groups within Syria. We raised the question with them. We hope that they will respond to our determined requests that they no longer support groups within their country that are responsible for terrorist acts outside of the country.

I think the particular question you asked is with respect to enticements. The only enticement I offered is the benefit of peace. We talked to President Asad about the future of his country, the advantages they would have in so many respects if they were able to enter into a peaceful relationship with Israel on such issues as trade, tourism and just the lessening of the burdens of armament all across the board—all the benefits of peace. Those are the kinds of enticements I talked to him about, nothing beyond that.

Finally, on U.S. foreign policy, of course the question you raised is the deep question of our times. American foreign policy should be both proactive and internationalist. That is the basis really on which I have tried to conduct the high office that I have.

We all have a special responsibility when American troops are involved to take every precaution we can and to make sure they are used in the interests of the United States. But where U.S. interests are involved, our American Armed Forces are there to serve American interests, and we are serving them in many instances around the world. In many instances, the risks are not academic, but the risks are brought home.

Take the services of our American forces in northern Iraq. We do not often think about that, but we certainly thought about it the other day when we had the friendly fire incident which cost the lives of so many Americans as well as people from other countries.

In Rwanda, the humanitarian effort we are undertaking there involves some risks; landing those giant aircraft on the small, rather primitive airport at Goma involves real risks for Americans. As General Shalikashvili says, there is no military operation that does not bring with it risks. It is a matter of balance. Where I strike the balance, Mr. Lantos, is in the definition of American interests. When there are strong American interests involved, then there is a justification for using American military forces.

Now, the definition of those interests can be controversial, but I think that that is what we have to make the lodestar of the use of American military forces. Are the American interests sufficiently great to justify the risks to American life? That is something, of course, that all of us in government have to take with the utmost seriousness.

As you look around the world, we are taking those risks day in and day out because we think American interests are involved, whether it is the American troops who are in Western Europe or American troops arrayed in the Sinai as part of that agreement there. There are a lot more American troops at risk than you realize if you didn't look down the list.

Unfortunately, an accident of the kind we had in northern Iraq brings back to mind how many times our military men and women are already putting their lives at risk. But it is a very deep subject that I look forward to spending an evening talking to you about sometime.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. Secretary, we have two people that still have questions. Mr. McCloskey, who was here earlier and has returned, has not had an opportunity. I understand Mr. Smith has a brief comment, and we will try our best to get you out of here.

Chairman HAMILTON. Mr. McCloskey.

PROSPECTS FOR A BOSNIAN SETTLEMENT

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Good morning. I am sorry for my in-and-out-ism here. There is a health markup, and a committee I had to chair on the former Yugoslavia. Good to see you today.

I am cautiously heartened by your statement on Bosnia, particularly the impending Contact Group discussions. I don't know if this has been discussed yet, but maybe it has.

But could you tell me what your prognosis is for success this weekend? Is there any sense that the Russians are moving with any good reports out of Belgrade? Will the contact team be ready to take definitive steps against the aggressor, particularly with the likes of Russia and Britain being ready to lift the arms embargo on a multilateral basis?

If you can answer that, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, I have just one brief question about the state of the alliance around Mostar right now. I would delay that.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Congressman, frankly, I am very concerned about the situation that we will confront this weekend. The Bosnian Government, as you know, has accepted the peace plan offered by the contact ministers; but the Serbs have not at this point. The Russians are continuing to try to persuade them. I don't really have a prediction as to whether or not they will be persuaded. I hope that they will be, but the Bosnian Serbs in the past few days, I think, have sent messages by their conduct that are very adverse to the situation. The cease-fire has been broken over and over again and the exclusion zone has been violated. So it is a matter of great concern to me. I can't say I am optimistic about it.

I am determined that the Contact Group ministers will focus on the consequences that we have earlier agreed on and outlined; that is, enhanced sanctions, stricter enforcement, leading, if nothing else works, to the possibility of a multilateral lifting of the arms embargo.

I talked about this at some length when you were attending to your other duties, Mr. McCloskey; but it is a very, very intractable problem. I welcome the chance to join you in working together on the problem rather than at odds on it. I hope we can make something of the President's peace endeavor, but if we cannot, then we have to turn to the consequences of trying to be effective in other respects.

SITUATION IN MOSTAR

On Mostar, I have confidence the Federation is continuing to be effective. My meetings with both the Croatians and the Muslims indicate to me a determination to make their federation work. There are clearly a lot of problems that are involved in knitting together those two communities, but at least at the top levels, there is a determination to make it work. I think that has been one of the favorable products of our policy which we started in February.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. May I ask if there is any serious consideration being given to backing up financially, or maybe with some technical or civil affairs teams, or whatever with American personnel and more financial resources on the ground there at Mostar? Particularly east Mostar, there are conditions, as you know, that are abysmal. At least until 2 weeks ago, Croatian ethnic cleansing was going on primarily against Muslims in West Mostar. As I have discussed with you previously, the idea of some visible American presence in these areas, I think—not in the combat sense—can go a long way.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. As you know, Congressman, the European Union has taken a particular responsibility for Mostar, putting in a civil affairs unit, taking some special responsibility in Mostar. I think the U.S. forces would probably not be brought to bear until there was some kind of peace agreement. If there was a peace agreement, I think our American forces would be concentrated in the Federation regions.

The responsibility the Germans have taken in Mostar has been one of the favorable aspects of the current period. I will look at the situation to see if there is anything which, within the present confines of our policy, we can do to be effective. We do have some hospital units, as you know, in Bosnia at the present time. But I would like to hear from you further or think about whether there is something we can do.

COMMISSION ON HAITI

Chairman HAMILTON. We will conclude with Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you for the additional time. Mr. Secretary.

A moment ago you indicated that the illegal government in Haiti would see a congressional commission as a delaying tactic. I beg to differ. They might feel that would help to forge a sustainable consensus on policy toward Haiti.

Let me note, the Chamber of Deputies is a duly elected, legitimate government. It is as legitimate as President Aristide, who was also elected by the people. They have endorsed this concept. To somehow negatively brush or paint the fact—and it seems to be a fact that Cedras does support such an entity would also put in question the Governors Island agreement, which he signed, embraced and fully supported.

There are many of us who feel this is a way of trying again—of getting a sustainable policy to try to address the humanitarian needs. Children are dying by the day in Haiti. We have got to look at whether or not we are part of that and—or whether or not we are part of the solution.

U.S. POLICY ON ABORTION

One additional thought. You said a moment ago in response to my question, the United States does not promote abortion. I am very gratified to hear that. Just so there is no misunderstanding about—as to what that means, does that mean we are not promoting the legalization of abortion?

As you know, there were 100 nations around the world that have protective statutes, some very strong, particularly in Central and South America and in Africa, that protect their children. Are we not promoting abortion legalization?

Finally, I do have questions to submit for the record on the envoy to Northern Ireland, which we are still waiting with bated breath for. I think many of us feel this in a bipartisan way, continued disappointment and discouragement; the human rights situation in the PRC continues to deteriorate.

The administration had it right a year ago with its Executive Order when it delineated very clear criteria, significant progress in human rights. That didn't happen. The policy was changed rather than enforcement of that policy.

I would yield.

OPPOSITION TO COMMISSION ON HAITI

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. On the first point you made, Congressman, I stand by my earlier statement that the appointment of a commission, the delay involved in staffing the commission and making the report, would be an unfortunate delaying tactic and would give the illegal government a sense of confidence that they had some time. I think the support of General Cedras for such a commission is some indication as to how it would be regarded in Haiti. I think it is not a positive step for resolution of that problem.

U.S. FAMILY PLANNING POLICY

On the second issue, Mr. Smith, the United States works within the context of the laws of the nations that we deal with. That includes their laws on family planning and abortion. We are not campaigning around the world for the change of those laws. Our intention is to work within the context of local laws to try to be effective, to be concerned about the health of women within those countries and the families within those countries.

As far as I know, our determined policy is to work within the context of existing law, rather than trying to promote an international change in the laws.

Chairman HAMILTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. It is a pleasure to have you. We wish you all the best.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAMILTON. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the committee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD
by Rep. Eliot L. Engel
and Responses Thereto

Question:

During the last several months I have heard disturbing reports about the treatment of Jews in Iran. While many human rights groups describe the situation of Jews in Iran as uncomfortable, yet tolerable, many Iranian Jews in America believe that the situation for Iran's 40,000-person Jewish community is bad, and getting worse.

-- What is your impression of the condition of the Jewish population in Iran?

Answer:

The revolution in 1979 led many Iranian Jews to conclude that they could not live securely in Iran; since then the community has shrunk considerable due to emigration.

Officially, the Iranian constitution recognizes Jews as a "protected" non-Muslim minority -- "people of the Book" along with Christians and Zoroastrians.

Both official and non-official harassment of religious minorities in Iran is commonplace. In 1993, the U.N. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights observed that there is "a broad consensus that there has been practically no progress in ensuring greater respect and protection for the rights of the non-Muslim religious communities" in Iran.

Question:

In particular on February 25, 1994, Faizullah Makhubat, a 78-year old leader of the Iranian Jewish community, was executed for the "crime" of "association with Zionism."

-- What does the U.S. know about the execution of Faizullah Makhubat. Is the U.S. pressing our friends and allies which have diplomatic relations with Iran to protect the killing of Makhubat?

Answer:

On March 8, an Iranian newspaper reported that an Iranian Jew, Faizullah Makhubat, was executed as "a spy for Israel" on February 24. Similar reports had been circulating in the Iranian Jewish emigre community.

Mr. Makhubat was 78 years old and was an active member of a Tehran synagogue. He was arrested in 1992 and reportedly sentenced to death for "associating with Zionism." The Iranian government has given no further details in what appears to be a killing motivated by anti-semitism.

The Untied States government publicly called this a deplorable act of brutality which the entire world should condemn. The U.S. urged others in the international community to join us in making clear to the Iranian government the world's condemnation of this act. We also renewed our call for the government of Iran to meet its obligations under the United Nations charter to respect the human rights of its citizens.

While we have had no confirmed reports of anti-semitic actions in Iran since Makhubat's execution, attacks on other religious minorities continue.

Question:

Recent press reports and statements from public officials indicated Iranian complicity in the bombings of Jewish and Israeli targets in Buenos Aires, London, and Panama. These attacks show the anti-semitic character of the Iranian regime and may help explain recent heightened concerns of Iranian Americans of the Jewish faith.

-- What are the Iranian domestic repercussions of the anti-Jewish, anti-Israeli attacks? Are similar attacks or other anti-semitic actions against Iran's Jews occurring?

Answer:

Concerning July's terrorist attacks on Israelis and Jews in Latin America and the U.K., the U.K. is working with the authorities in the countries where the bombings occurred. These investigations are still underway. We have had no reports so far that the recent bombings coincide with attacks against Jews inside Iran. We and other interested governments are monitoring the situation of Iranian Jews to the extent possible.

Question:

What is the United States doing about Israel's exclusion from any regional grouping at the United Nations? Will the funding of specific U.N. agencies be affected by their exclusion of Israel?

Answer:

The Untied States strongly favors full Israeli eligibility for U.N. elective offices such as the Security Council. This is why we support Israel's membership in one of the five regional groupings at the U.N. which propose candidates for elective offices, and have worked hard to gain Israeli acceptance into one of them. With the dramatic progress in the peace process and in the region, we will continue efforts to rectify this imbalance so that Israel will be accorded the full rights and privileges of U.N. membership. As we pursue this course amid these changing times, it would not be useful to withhold funding from U.N. agencies.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05982 047 0

ISBN 0-16-044903-0